## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \* \* \*

3:08-cv-00537-LRH-VPC

Plaintiff,

V.

E.K. MCDANIEL, et al.;

Defendants.

The Court has considered the Order of United States Magistrate Judge Valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge valeriantered on Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Sentember 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Sentember 22, 2010, in which the

The Court has considered the Order of United States Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (#110) entered on September 22, 2010, in which the Magistrate Judge granted in part and denied in part Plaintiff's Bill of Costs (#87-1)<sup>1</sup>, and denied Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Order (#90), Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendants' Errata (#101), Plaintiff's Motion to Supplement Costs (#102) and Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (#103). Plaintiff filed his objections to the Order (#112) on October 15, 2010, and Defendants filed their opposition to the objections (#113) on October 28, 2010. The Court has considered the pleadings and memoranda of the parties and other relevant matters of record and has made a review and determination in accordance with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule 1B 3-1(a) of the Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

It appearing to the Court that the Magistrate's Order is neither erroneous nor contrary to law, and good cause appearing, the Court determines that the Magistrate's Order (#110) entered on September

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Refers to the court's docket number.

1	22, 2010, is ADOPTED and ACCEPTED, and
2	IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Bill of Costs (#87-1) is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED
3	IN PART. Plaintiff has met his burden in demonstrating that he is entitled to \$278.36 in costs.
4	However, Plaintiff has not shown that deposit of the funds into his Trust 2 account is required.
5	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Bill of Costs (#87-1) is deemed FILED and that
6	Defendants' response thereto (#94) is deemed timely FILED.
7	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Bill of Costs (#87-1) be GRANTED IN PART and
8	DENIED IN PART. Plaintiff is entitled to \$278.36 in costs. Plaintiff's Bill of Costs is DENIED in all
9	other respects. <sup>2</sup>
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Order (#90) is DENIED.
11	Defendants are to pay Plaintiff all monies due in the lawsuit in accordance with the order set forth
12	above.
13	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendants' Errata (#101) is
14	DENIED.
15	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Supplement Costs (#102) is
16	DENIED.
17	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (#103) is DENIED.
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.
19	
20	DATED this 5th day of February, 2011.
21	DATED this 5th day of February, 2011.  Slating
22	
23	LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25	
26	
27	<sup>2</sup> Defendants are reminded that Plaintiff was awarded post-judgment interest and that amount
28	is set forth in that order (#96).